

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed **April 21, 2005**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1, 3-5, 7-11, 13-15, 17-21, 23-25, and 27-33. Claims 1, 3-5, 7-11, 13-15, 17-21, 23-25, and 27-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Maier et al (USPN 5,625,815, hereinafter “Maier”) in view of Elmasri et al (*Fundamentals of Database System*, Copyright 2000, hereinafter “Elmasri”) and further in view of Jagadish et al (USPN 6,351,753 B1 hereinafter “Jagadish”).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1, 11, and 21 were rejected as being unpatentable over Maier in view of Elmasri and further in view of Jagadish. Applicant respectfully points out that the combined system of Maier, Elmasri, and Jagadish teaches creating audit entries for **each transaction** (see Maier, col. 4, lines 12-12).

In contrast, the present invention creates audit records for **only selected rows** in relational tables that are accessed by the query and that satisfy an auditing condition, wherein the auditing condition specifies selecting a row based on a value of a field in the row in the relational database (see page 7, lines 13-19 of the instant application). This is beneficial because it allows selectively auditing only accesses to rows that include sensitive data without auditing accesses to rows that do not include sensitive data. For example, including both the auditing condition “salary > 1,000,000” and the auditing condition “title = ‘CEO’” instructs the relational database to create an audit record only for rows that are accessed within a table that include a salary field with a value greater than 1,000,000, or that include a title field specifying a CEO. Accesses to other rows in the table that do not satisfy either of these auditing conditions do not cause an audit record to be generated. There is nothing within Maier, Elmasri, or Jagadish, either separately or in concert, which suggests creating audit records for only selected rows in relational tables that are accessed by the query and that satisfy an auditing

condition, wherein the auditing condition specifies selecting a row based on a value of a field in the row in the relational database.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 11, and 21 to clarify that the present invention creates audit records for only selected rows in relational tables that are accessed by the query and that satisfy an auditing condition, wherein the auditing condition specifies selecting a row based on a value of a field in the row in the relational database. These amendments find support on page 7, lines 13-19 of the instant application.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 11, and 21 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 3-5, 7-10 and 31, which depend upon claim 1, claims 13-15, claims 17-20 and 32, which depend upon claim 11, and claims 23-25, 27-30 and 33, which depend upon claim 21, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

By



Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47,615

Date: 20 May 2005

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95616-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665